

5/24/75

Mr. Tom Susman, Counsel
Administrative Practices Subcommittee
New Senate Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C.

Dear Tom,

One of the other matters to which I referred in my last letter was the Silbert nomination and a story dealing with Senator Tunney's position on it. Today's Post has an L.A. Times story (p.4) which prompts my writing now.

I'd have taken a more active role were it not that I'm already into too much.

I have two interests in Silbert. One is the suborning of perjury by his office in my C.A. 2052-73 to frustrate the FOI law and continue suppression of what could not be suppressed legally. The other is from the first of two Watergate books I have written. I laid this first one aside when it grew too long. The draft of the second is completed but I have not been able to return to it in almost eight months.

The judge ignored false swearing in C.A. 2052-73 but ruled on fact and on fact held for me and against the government on that issue, the phoney claim to "national security."

In this first Watergate book I have a chapter as long as a short book on L. Patrick Gray. It deals extensively with the existing record, the record available to Silbert and his assistants.

My own opinion is that these were enough leads to break the case in the earliest days. In fact, I also believe that in offering this to any who have an interest I am jeopardizing the possibilities of ever doing anything with the book.

However, it should also be understood that this same information was in the possession of the Judiciary Committee. I can make a distinction others may not. Senators and not elected to be investigators. They can fail to perceive what it is the obligation of the prosecutor to seek and comprehend.

I have never been able to get two of the early items of Watergate evidence used in court - not in any way secret. Recently I asked Jim Lesar to try again, with Levi. One of these, exhibits in the original trial, certainly ought to contain leads not followed. They are the addressbooks of the Cubans.

So, if anyone has the interest and I can help, I'm willing.

Sincerely,

Arnold Weisberg

Democratic Caucus Leader Burton has announced that he, personally, will kill any effort at any JFK assassination investigation in the Congress unless EMK personally wants or asks for it.

Mark Lane reportedly is making an appearance in the San Francisco area this weekend to challenge Burton on this position. I believe that aside from promoting Lane all this can do is freeze Burton into a bad position, giving him the choice between saying he was irresponsible or insisting firmly and publicly on the bad position.

I think that after whatever he says in response to whatever Lane says, if Burton reacts at all or if he does not, after he has had time to, Burton should be asked questions:

When the first thing LBJ did was to by-pass RFK by putting Hoover in direct charge of the initial investigation and when RFK as AG completely detached himself from this investigation, why should anyone now insist on injecting EMK into it?

Why should EMK not be permitted to remain detached, as he has been?

Does this not in effect make EMK a dictator?

Give him veto over what the House can deliberate and decide?

Ought not national interest rather than anyone's personal desires control?

If there are doubts, ought they not be resolved, questions not answered asked and answered?

Does he have any reason to believe that EMK has any personal knowledge?

Has EMK not in fact said he knows nothing and has read nothing but merely trusts the government - but would be for a new investigation if there appears to be a basis for this?

Possibility: key in with showing him a copy of my spectro/NAA/FBI affidavit.